REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed July 14, 2004. Claims 1 – 51 were pending. Claims 1 – 51 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract for being too long. Applicant has amended the Abstract accordingly.

Claims 1 – 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over De Greef et al. (USPN 6,549,217, hereinafter "De Greef"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The bookmark information described in De Greef specifies a "user profile" that when activated "causes the display to be arranged according to the indicated display arrangement" (De Greef -- col. 2, lines 48-67). Figs. 1 and 2 of De Greef illustrate examples of how application windows may be arranged on a display according to a bookmarked user profile as described in De Greef. The bookmarked user profiles of De Greef indicate display arrangement information, but they do not specify a uniform resource locator (URL). The Examiner appears to have misinterpreted the teaching in De Greef at col. 12, lines 12-15 which states: "Alternatively, the address of the desired set of bookmarks can be input to the bookmark manager as a universal resource locator, or as the network address of a file, or so forth." This portion of De Greef pertains to how a set of bookmarks may be addressed, not what is specified by the bookmarks. De Greef teaches that a set of bookmarks may be addressed at a URL, but De Greef does not teach that the bookmarks themselves specify a URL. To the contrary, De Greef specifically teaches that his bookmarks specify a display arrangement. Thus, the rejection of claim 1 is clearly unsupported by the cited art. Similar arguments apply in regard to independent claims 10, 18, 26, 33, 36, 38, 42 and 48.

3

In regard to claim 2, Applicant traverses the Examiner's contention that De Greef teaches that receiving user input from the user specifying bookmark information comprises receiving user input requesting to bookmark the URL. The Examiner cites col. 12, lines 8-15 of De Greef. However, as discussed above, the portion of De Greef describes that a set of bookmarks may be addressed at a URL. This portion of De Greef has nothing to do with bookmarking a URL. The bookmarks of De Greef are described as specifying display arrangements, not URLs. Similar arguments apply in regard to claim 12.

In regard to claim 7, Applicant traverses the Examiner's contention that De Greef teaches a program on the client computer system operable to determine whether the user wants to store the bookmark information locally or remotely in response to said receiving the user input requesting to store the bookmark information. The Examiner cites portions of De Greef that state that bookmarked user profiles can reside either on the client system, or on the server system, or on both. However, these teachings in De Greef do not mean that any determination is made of where a user wants the bookmarks to be stored. For example, the bookmark manager in De Greef might store the bookmarks on the client, server or both without making any determination of where the user wants the information to be stored. De Greef does not teach a program on the client computer system operable to determine whether the user wants to store the bookmark information locally or remotely in response to said receiving the user input requesting to store the bookmark information. Similar arguments apply in regard to claims 22 and 49.

In addition to the arguments presented in regard to claim 1, Applicant traverses the Examiner's contention in regard to claim 33 that De Greef teaches a method for sharing bookmark information among different computer systems comprising a first computer system receiving user input specifying bookmark information, the first computer system communicating with a server computer system in order to store the bookmark information on the server computer system, and a second computer system communicating with the server computer system in order to retrieve the stored bookmark information. De Greef does not teach a first computer system storing bookmark

4

information to a server and a second computer system retrieving the same bookmark information from the server. The Examiner states that either one of computers 57 in De Greef's Fig. 3B can be labeled as first or second computer since both are able to communicate with the server computer system. However, while De Greef may teach that multiple client computers may address bookmarks on a server, De Greef does not teach that one of the client computers stores a bookmark to the server and a different client computer retrieves <u>the same</u> bookmark from the server. For example, in De Greef each client computer may address its own bookmarks on the server. There is no teaching in De Greef that states that a first client computer stores a bookmark to the server and a different client computer retrieves the bookmark from the server that was stored by the first client computer. Similar arguments apply in regard to claims 19, 30, 36 and 38.

In regard to claim 34, Applicant traverses the Examiner's contention that De Greef teaches a first software application having web-browsing functionality communicating with the server computer system in order to store the bookmark information on the server computer system and second software application having web-browsing functionality communicating with the server computer system in order to retrieve the stored bookmark information. De Greef teaches that a bookmark manager stores and retrieves the bookmarks (De Greef -- Fig. 4; col. 11, lines 55-67). The bookmark manager in De Greef is not described as <u>an application having web-browsing functionality</u>. Therefore, the rejection of claim 34 is further unsupported by the cited art.

In regard to claim 39, Applicant traverses the Examiner's contention that De Greef teaches that the server is configured to receive first user information that specifies a particular user, store the bookmark information in association with the particular user, and receive a request for the bookmark information from the second client computer system that <u>specifies the same particular user</u>. Although De Greef teaches that multiple computers may be connected to the network, De Greef does not teach that the server receives information from a first computer that specifies a particular user and stores the bookmark information in association with the particular user, and receives a request for the bookmark information from the second client computer system that <u>specifies the same</u>

5

particular user. Therefore, the rejection of claim 39 is further unsupported by the cited art.

Applicant also asserts that numerous other ones of the claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. Since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion in regard to the remaining dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

No fees are believed necessary; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505\5181-78600\RCK.

A return receipt postcard is submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: October 13, 2004

7